

REMARKS

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Claims 1, 2, 5-10, and 12-18 are present in this application. Claims 15-18 have been added. Claims 1, 6, 8, 9, and 14 are independent. Claims 3 and 11 have been canceled in this response.

Summary of Statement of Interview

The Supervisor is thanked for conducting a telephone interview to discuss the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Claim 6 has been amended based on recommendations obtained during the interview.

Claim Rejection under 35 USC 112

Claims 6, 7, and 13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Based on recommendations by the Examiner's Supervisor, Applicant has amended claim 6. Applicant requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim Rejection under 35 USC 102(b) - Koefeld

Claims 1-3, 9-11 and 14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,260,706 (Koefeld). Claims 1 and 9 have been amended. Applicant traverses this rejection based on the claims as amended.

Claims 1 and 9

Claims 1 and 9 recite "a positional portion provided along an entire periphery of said frame, for determining the positional relationship between the display substrate accommodating tray and another display substrate accommodating tray which is to be stacked thereon."

As disclosed in the present specification, "A bottom edge of the frame 12 of the upper display substrate accommodating tray ... is engaged with the positioning step 14 of a lower

display substrate accommodating tray ...Therefore, the display substrate accommodating trays 10a and 10b stacked vertically do not slip in a horizontal direction with respect to each other."

The Office Action alleges that Koefeld's bottom surface 12 constitutes the claimed bottom section, walls 14, 16, 18, and 20 constitute the claimed frame, and handles 30 constitute the claimed engaging section. Furthermore, the Office Action alleges that feet 46, 48, 50, 52 constitute the claimed positioning portion.

Applicant submits that Koefeld's feet 46, 48, 50, 52 do not provide a secure engagement between trays. In order to clarify this distinction, claims 1 and 9 have been amended to include the subject matter of claims 3 and 11 respectively, and to recite "a positioning portion provided along an entire periphery of said frame." Applicant submits that Koefeld fails to teach or suggest at least this feature.

Applicant submits that the arrangement of a positioning portion provided along an entire periphery of the frame offers the advantage that a more secure engagement between trays can be obtained. The arrangement is especially important in the field of accommodating glass substrates.

Claim 14

With regard to claim 14, the rejection is deficient in that it does not particularly point out what in Koefeld teaches the claimed feature of an engaging section that extends "from a side surface of the frame along an entire periphery of the frame." In any case, Applicant submits that Koefeld's handle 30 does not meet the claimed limitation.

For at least the above reasons, Applicant requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim Rejection under 35 USC 103 - Koefeld, Akihiro

Claims 6-8 and 13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koefeld in view of JP 11-059893 (Akihiro). Applicant traverses this rejection.

Claims 6 and 8

The Office Action alleges that rest 32 of Akihiro teaches the claimed second supporting member. Applicant disagrees.

The claimed second supporting is capable of supporting the display substrate accommodating tray as the display substrate is raised above the accommodating tray.

As can be seen in Fig. 6 of Akihiro, the rest 32 remains stationary and does not provide support while the display substrate is being raised above the accommodating tray. Akihiro discloses that, "a control section 12 carries out actuation control of the carrier robot 13, inserts a rod 33 in the insertion hole 27, and lays the substrate holder 21 on a rest 32. Then glass substrate G ... is taken out from a substrate holder 21." (see paragraph 0032 of the machine translation for Akihiro).

In order to clarify this distinction, claim 6 has been amended to recite that the second supporting member is capable of "supporting the display substrate accommodating tray while the display substrate is being raised above the accommodating tray." Applicant submits that Akihiro fails to teach this claimed feature. Applicant submits that Koefeldt also fails to teach at least this claimed feature, and thus fails to make up for the deficiency.

Claim 8 has also been amended to recite a step of positioning the rest of the bottom section to be coincident with a position of a second supporting member adapted to be pushed downwards by the accommodating tray when the accommodating tray is placed thereon. For reasons similar to the above for claim 6, Applicant submits that Akihiro and Koefeldt, either alone or in combination, fail to teach at least this claimed feature.

Applicant requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim Rejection under 35 USC 103(a) - Koefeldt, Nakajima

Claims 5 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koefeldt in view of JP 236,953 (Nakajima). Applicant traverses this rejection.

Claim 5 depends from claim 1. Subject matter of claim 12 is comparable to claim 5 and depends from claim 9. Thus, at least for the reasons above for claims 1 and 9, Applicant submits that the rejection fails to establish prima facie obviousness for claims 5 and 12, as well.

Nakajima discloses a manufacturing method that incorporates a foamed sheet body 10. Applicant submits that Nakajima also fails to teach or suggest the claimed "positioning portion." Thus, Nakajima fails to make up for the deficiency of claims 1 and 9. Accordingly, at least for this additional reason, Koefeld and Nakajima, either alone or in combination, fail to teach each and every claimed element of claims 5 or 12.

Applicant requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

New Claims

Claims 15-18 have been added to recite further features of claim 6. Applicant submits that neither of the references Koefeld or Akihiro discloses these additional claimed features.

Conclusion

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Robert W. Downs (Reg. No. 48,222) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.17 and 1.136(a), the Applicants respectfully petition for a one (1) month extension of time for filing a response in connection with the present application and the required fee of \$120.00 is being filed concurrently herewith.

Application No. 10/630,731
Amendment dated May 5, 2006
Reply to Office Action of January 16, 2006

Docket No.: 0717-0513P

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: May 5, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By Robert W. Douns #48,222
Charles Gorenstein
Registration No.: 29,271
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road
Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant